

# The Difference Between the Amati and Ghirlanda Relations

Amir Levinson<sup>1</sup> & David Eichler<sup>2</sup>

## ABSTRACT

It is pointed out that the beaming correction commonly inferred from the achromatic breaks in the afterglow light curve, is biased in situations where the isotropic equivalent energy is affected by factors other than the spread in opening angles. In particular, it underestimates the beaming factor of sources observed off-axis. Here we show that both the slopes and scatters in the Amati and Ghirlanda relations, and the difference between them, are quantitatively consistent with a model proposed recently, in which the  $E_{iso} - \nu_{peak}$  relation, as originally derived by Amati et al., is due to viewing angle effects. The quantitative difference between them confirms the relations between opening angle and break time suggested by Frail et al.

*Subject headings:* black hole physics — gamma-rays: bursts and theory

A correlation between the isotropic equivalent energy of GRB's,  $E_{iso}$ , and the location of the spectral peak at local redshift,  $\nu_p$ , has been reported recently for a sample of BeppoSAX and HETE2 sources with measured redshifts and well observed spectra (Amati et al. 2002; Atteia et al. 2003; Lamb et al. 2004). This relation can be represented as a power law,

$$(E_{iso}/10^{52}\text{erg}) \sim (h\nu_p/100\text{KeV})^\alpha, \quad (1)$$

with  $\alpha = 2$ , and spans two orders of magnitude in  $\nu_p$ , roughly from 10 KeV to 1 MeV, and about four orders of magnitude in  $E_{iso}$ . The extension to low energies is based on a small number of X-ray flashes with measurable redshifts. It does not preclude the possibility that many X-ray flashes derive their low apparent peak luminosities in part due to cosmological redshift. A similar correlation between the collimation-corrected energy and  $\nu_p$ , with a smaller scatter and a different slope, has been reported by Ghirlanda et al. (2004; hereafter GGL04) for a subsample of the sources that exhibit achromatic breaks in the afterglow light curves.

---

<sup>1</sup>School of Physics and Astronomy, Tel-Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel; Levinson@wise.tau.ac.il

<sup>2</sup>Physics Department, Ben-Gurion University, Beer-Sheva 84105, Israel; eichler@bgumail.bgu.ac.il

Eichler & Levinson (2004; hereafter EL04) proposed that the  $E_{iso} - \nu_p$  correlation can be interpreted as due to an orientation effect. They have shown that an annular jet with a single, universal spectrum can give rise to the observed relation over about two orders of magnitude in  $\nu_p$ , when observed off-axis along different sight lines, provided the opening angle and angular width of the jet are larger than  $1/\Gamma$ , where  $\Gamma$  is the Lorentz factor of the emitting material (see appendix for an approximate analytic derivation). The effect is not necessarily specific to annular jet; it applies to any geometry in which the emission along the line of sight is comprised of contribution from an extended source (e.g., Toma, et al. 2005). However, there are *a priori* reasons to favor an annular geometry (see below). EL04 also calculated the rate distribution of observed peak energies  $\nu_p$ , and have shown that the relative number of XRFs observed is compatible with the model, provided the angular width of the emitting region is not too large. (Off-axis effects have been considered also by Yamazaki et al. [2004, and references therein]. However, they assumed an *ad hoc* intrinsic relation between  $E_{iso}$  and  $\nu_p$  designed to fit the observations.) If off-axis effects are affecting  $\nu_p$  and  $E_{iso}$  then the various quantities one derive from GRB observations need to have this effect folded in. For example, Eichler & Jontof-Hutter (2005) have recalculated the average prompt gamma ray to blast wave energy ratio and found it to be considerably higher than previous estimates, simply because the prompt gamma rays are more affected by viewing angle effects than the blast wave energy as inferred from the afterglow. The normalization of the  $E_{iso} - \nu_p$  curve produced by the model of EL04 depends on the amount of energy per solid angle ejected by the source, which for a standard energy release is inversely proportional to the solid angle subtended by the emitting region. Evidently, any spread in this parameter in a sample of sources should be reflected as a scatter in the resultant correlation. Under the assumption of a standard energy output, this scatter can be reduced essentially by correcting for beaming. If an absolute way can be found to correct for beaming, then the model naively predicts the collimation-corrected energy to satisfy the same relation as the isotropic equivalent energy, but with a different normalization and virtually no scatter.

An attempt to derive a relation between the collimation-corrected GRB energy, denoted here by  $E_{\gamma,app}$  for future purposes, and the peak energy has been made recently by GGL04. These authors considered a sample of 24 GRBs with measured redshift and peak energy, for which the break time of the afterglow light curve,  $t_{break}$ , is well constrained. They found indeed a tight relation between  $E_{\gamma,app}$  and the observed peak energy  $\nu_p$ , but with a different slope:  $E_{\gamma,app} \propto \nu_p^{0.7}$ . At first sight this seems to be in conflict with the prediction of the model discussed above. However, careful examination reveals that this result is in fact consistent with the hypothesis that the Amati relation is due to viewing angle effects, and that the change in slope is primarily due to a bias in the beaming correction used by GGL04.

In order to correct for beaming GGL04 estimate the opening angle of the emitting jet

for each source in their sample, using the two observables,  $E_{iso}$  and  $t_{break}$ , and the relation:

$$\theta(t_{break}, E_{iso}) = 0.161 \left( \frac{t_{break,d}}{1+z} \right)^{3/8} \left( \frac{n\eta_\gamma}{E_{iso,52}} \right)^{1/8}. \quad (2)$$

Here  $t_{break,d}$  is the break time measured in days,  $\eta_\gamma$  is the radiative efficiency, and  $n$  the density of the circumburst ambient medium, assumed to be constant. Since the radiative efficiency is unknown, they invoked a single value for all sources of  $\eta_\gamma = 0.2$ . For the circumburst density they adopted the value  $n = 3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$  for all sources, except five for which estimates for  $n$  are available in the literature. The collimation-corrected energy was then taken to be:  $E_{\gamma,app} = (1 - \cos \theta) E_{iso} \simeq (\theta^2/2) E_{iso}$ . Since the opening angle given by eq. (2) depends on  $E_{iso}$ , it is clear that it may be subject to biases in cases where  $E_{iso}$  is influenced by effects other than the spread in the opening angle. This is particularly true for sources observed off-axis, for which eq. (2) underestimates the beaming factor. Furthermore, the break time of the afterglow emission may appear longer for off-axis observers (Granot et al. 2002), leading to an even larger bias. The latter effect is typically small, except for the very soft sources (i.e., those observed at the largest viewing angles). In the following we provide a quantitative treatment of these biases.

The model outlined in EL04 assumes a uniform, axisymmetric jet of opening angle  $\theta_2$ , with intrinsic spectral peak at  $\nu^*$ , and with a hole of angular size  $\theta_1$  cut out of it. This symmetry was chosen strictly for convenience, and it can be easily seen that the scaling derived in EL04 applies to more complicated geometries. The peak frequency and the observed isotropic energy were calculated numerically for different viewing angles inside the hole and outside the jet, and it was found that a relation  $E_{iso} \propto \nu_p^\alpha$  holds over a wide range of  $\nu_p$ , with  $\alpha$  laying in the range between 2 and 3, depending on source parameters. In particular,  $\alpha \simeq 2$  when  $\theta_2$  and  $\Delta\theta = \theta_2 - \theta_1$  are larger than  $\Gamma^{-1}$ . The analysis of EL04 does not account for a possible spread in source parameters. In particular, the normalization of the  $E_{iso} - \nu_p$  relation produced by the model, depends on the angular distribution of the released energy. To illustrate how this might affect the observed  $E_{iso} - \nu_p$  relation, we consider a sample of sources having a universal spectrum and a standard energy output,  $E_\gamma$ , but a range of opening angles. Denote by  $A_b = 4\pi/\Delta\Omega$  the corresponding beaming factor, where  $\Delta\Omega$  is the solid angle subtends by the gamma-ray emission region. For a symmetric (double sided), hollow jet we have  $\Delta\Omega = 4\pi \int_{\theta_1}^{\theta_2} \sin \theta d\theta = 4\pi(\cos \theta_1 - \cos \theta_2)$ , and  $A_b = (\cos \theta_1 - \cos \theta_2)^{-1} \simeq 2/(\theta_2^2 - \theta_1^2)$ . The isotropic equivalent energy measured for a source observed at some angle corresponding to an observed peak energy  $\nu_p$ , can then be expressed as,

$$E_{iso} = A_b E_\gamma (\nu_p / \nu_{p,max})^\alpha. \quad (3)$$

Here  $\nu_{p,max} = 2\Gamma\nu^*$  denotes the peak frequency of a source observed head-on. Consequently, a sample of sources with fixed  $E_\gamma$  and a range of beaming factors  $A_b$  would form a family

of parallel lines in the  $E_{iso} - \nu_p$  plane, with each line corresponding to a subset of sources with beaming factors in the interval  $(A_b, A_b + dA_b)$ . It is tempting to interpret figure 2 in Ghirlanda et al. (2005) and figure 5 in Bosnjak et al. (2005) as such. The sample studied originally by Amati (2002), that contained particularly bright bursts, may consist mainly of the subset of sources with the largest beaming factors, and therefore defines a boundary in the  $E_{iso} - \nu_p$  plane, as suggested by Nakar & Piran (2004).

There are several reasons why the GRB fireball might be shaped like a thick annulus. First, the collimation of supersonic material can itself produce an annular shaped, high entropy jet (Eichler 1982, Levinson & Eichler 2000; Begelman & Blandford, private communication) because the jet material tends to accumulate into a shock-compressed layer at the confining walls. Second, the soft gamma ray emission is likely to originate from that part of the jet that is baryon loaded, and the baryon loading may come from the periphery. In the particular case of baryon loading by neutron leakage from the walls of a confining wind or stellar envelope (Levinson & Eichler 2003), the neutrons are quickly charged by collisions near the walls, before they can penetrate to the center. It was shown in the above reference that the annular region that is significantly loaded can have a solid angle that is not too much less than the inner hollow region. Third, gamma-rays emitted by a compact photosphere (Eichler & Levinson, 2000) can mostly impinge on the baryon rich periphery of the outflow and be dragged along by it, and thus be concentrated into a an annulus with a smaller total solid angle than that into which they were originally emitted. The inner core may be comprised of Poynting flux that contribute very little to the soft gamma-ray emission, but nonetheless carry a considerable fraction of the ejected energy. Thus, even though the gamma-ray emission region may be annular, the total energy carried by the outflow is likely distributed more uniformly inside the cone. Now, the structure of the blast wave driven by the collision of the fireball and the surrounding gas depends mainly on the angular distribution of total energy of the piston. It is therefore reasonable to assume that at small viewing angles the break in the afterglow light curve is associated with the opening angle of the outer cone. At large viewing angles, the break time of the afterglow emission may be altered. The exact shape of the afterglow light curve as viewed by off-axis observers may depend on details. For sight lines outside the jet, one might naively expect a break when the Lorentz factor drops to  $\Gamma \sim 1/\theta_n$ , where  $\theta_n$  is the viewing angle measured with respect to the jet axis (Granot et al., 2002). The angular separation corresponding to an observed peak energy  $\nu_p$  is given by:  $\theta_n - \theta_2 = \Gamma^{-1}(2\nu_{p,max}/\nu_p - 2)^{1/2}$ . The distribution of opening angles inferred from the achromatic breaks of the afterglow emission peaks at  $\theta \sim 0.1$  (Frail et al. 2001; Guetta et al. 2005; Ghirlanda et al. 2005). Adopting this value for  $\theta_2$  we find that  $\theta_n - \theta_2 < \theta_2$  if  $\nu_{p,max}/\nu_p < \Gamma^2/200$ . For reasonable values of the Lorentz factor  $\Gamma$  this condition is satisfied essentially for all sources in the GGL04 sample, and we

therefore anticipate the break time not to be significantly altered by viewing angle effects. For observers looking down the hole the break time may appear unaltered. Let us denote by  $q(\nu_p) = t_{break}(\nu_p)/t_{break}(\nu_{p,max}) \geq 1$  the ratio of break times measured by off-axis and head-on observers. Suppose that for a source observed head-on, the opening angle obtained by substituting the observed energy,  $E_{iso} = A_b E_\gamma$ , and break time,  $t_{break}$ , into eq. (2) is roughly  $\theta_2$ , viz.,  $\theta(t_{break}(\nu_{p,max}), A_b E_\gamma) \simeq \theta_2$ . Then for the same source observed off axis the inferred opening angle would be,  $\theta(t_{break}, E_{iso}) \simeq \theta_2 q^{3/8} (\nu_p/\nu_{p,max})^{-\alpha/8}$ , where eqs (2) and (3) have been used. The apparent collimation-corrected GRB energy,  $E_{\gamma,app}$ , is then given by

$$E_{\gamma,app} = \frac{\theta^2}{2} A_b E_\gamma (\nu_p/\nu_{p,max})^\alpha \simeq \frac{q^{3/4}}{1 - (\theta_1/\theta_2)^2} E_\gamma (\nu_p/\nu_{p,max})^{3\alpha/4}. \quad (4)$$

For  $\alpha = 2$  and  $q = 1$ , the last equation yields:

$$E_{\gamma,app} \propto \nu_p^{1.5}, \quad (5)$$

in agreement with the result obtained by GGL04,  $E_{\gamma,app} \propto \nu_p^{1.416 \pm 0.09}$ . We expect the index to be somewhat smaller than 1.5, owing to break time effects contributed by the softest sources, those with  $\nu_p \ll \nu_{p,max}$ , for which the ratio  $q$  may already be large enough to affect the correlation. As seen from eq. (4) the value of  $E_{\gamma,app}$  predicted by the model depends in addition on the ratio  $\theta_1/\theta_2$ . This parameter is uncertain in the present picture. A spread in this parameter will contribute a scatter in the observed  $E_{\gamma,app} - \nu_p$  relation. The inverse correlation between  $E_{iso}$  and jet opening angle (Frail et al. 2001; van Putten & Regimbau 2003), seems to imply that the annulus is reasonably thick, such that it subtends a significant fraction of the solid angle subtended by its outer cone. In this case the scatter is expected to be rather small. For the range of parameters adopted in EL04 the values of the coefficient  $1/[1 - (\theta_1/\theta_2)^2]$  in eq. (4) vary between 1 and 1.5.

The above theoretical explanation is consistent with the observed correlation between  $\nu_p$  and the inferred opening angle (Eichler & Jontof-Hutter, 2005), where the inferred opening angle shows the tendency to increase with decreasing  $\nu_p$ . The point is that the inferred opening angle is weakly biased towards larger values when  $E_{iso}$  is underestimated due to off angle viewing (see eq. 2).

Whether the observed relations discussed above hold for the entire population of GRBs or are the result of some selection effects is at present under debate. Several groups have attempted to perform consistency checks for large samples of BATSE sources with known fluence and well determined peak energy. Nakar & Piran (2004) analyzed trajectories in the  $E_{iso} - \nu_p$  plane obtained for sources with a measured fluence and observed peak energy,  $\nu_{p,obs} = \nu_p/(1+z)$ , by varying the redshift. They then define a source to be an outlier if the minimum distance between its trajectory and the curve representing the Amati relation

exceeds a certain value. By applying this test to a sample of bright bursts from (Band et al. 1993; Jimenez et al. 2000) they concluded that about 50% of the sources in their sample are outliers. However, they also concluded that the line representing the Amati relation defines a boundary of the region in the  $E_{iso} - \nu_p$  plane which is populated with sources. In other words, all outliers should be dim, hard bursts. As argued above, this boundary may represent the subsample of GRBs with the smallest opening angles. Band & Preece (2005) extended this work to a larger sample of BATSE sources and tested in addition the Ghirlanda correlation. They find an even larger number of sources to be inconsistent with the Amati relation. The number of outliers to the Ghirlanda relation depends on the assumed distribution of beaming factors, and appears to be much smaller, at least for certain choices of beaming correction. This better agreement may be due to the smaller scatter in the Ghirlanda correlation, although we are aware of the large uncertainty in the distribution of opening angles that might affect the significance of this result. Different consistency checks have been performed subsequently by two other groups. Ghirlanda et al. (2005) analyzed a sample of 442 bursts with what they term “pseudo redshifts” which have been estimated using the lag-luminosity relation (Norris et al. 2000; Norris 2002). Bosnjak et al. (2005) tested the consistency of the Amati relation with the fluence distribution of bright BATSE bursts assuming that the GRB population follows the star formation rate. Both groups concluded that their samples are consistent with the  $E_{iso} - \nu_p$  relation discovered by Amati, but with a larger scatter than originally found (but cf., Nakar & Piran, 2005).

Here we are arguing that the scatter is to be expected. Clearly, if there are two effects that are creating two separate correlations, a study of just one of them will find scatter. As suggested above, both opening angle effects (Frail et al. 2001) and viewing angle effects (EL04) are each creating their own correlation: the opening angle effect would create scatter in  $E_{iso}$  even for head-on viewers and even if there were no scatter in  $E_\gamma$ , and a viewing angle effect would create scatter in the observed  $E_{iso}$  even if there were no scatter in  $E_\gamma$  or in  $E_\gamma/\theta^2$ . In addition, extreme outliers such as GRB 980425 can be attributed to a relatively large angle scattering off material with a relatively modest Lorentz factor (Eichler & Levinson 1999; Nakamura, 1998). Assuming that this component is weak it can probably only be seen from very nearby GRBs.

In conclusion, a population of beamed sources with a standard energy output and a universal intrinsic spectrum, viewed along different sight lines, can explain the Amati and Ghirlanda relations. The small scatter in the peak energy - collimation corrected energy correlation reported by GGL04 indicates that the scatter in the  $E_{iso} - \nu_p$  relation is predominantly due to a spread in the solid angle subtended by the gamma-ray emission region, and that the total energy output in gamma-rays of long GRBs is narrowly clustered. The total energy released as gamma rays should equal roughly the corrected energy  $E_{\gamma,app}$  of the hard-

est source in the GGL04 sample,  $E_\gamma \sim 2 \times 10^{51}$  ergs. Consistency checks of the Amati and Ghirlanda relations on large samples should allow for the potentially large scatter produced by the opening angle effect and for biases in the beaming correction factor. Larger samples of sources with measured redshifts, particularly dim soft bursts, are ultimately needed to confirm those relations. The original argument of Frail et al. (2001), that the scatter in  $E_{iso}$  is greatly reduced when the beaming correction they make is invoked may have naively appeared to have been confounded by the large spread in apparent  $E_{iso}$  that remained. Here, however, we have noted that the observable difference between the slopes of the Ghirlanda and Amati relations in fact provides an interesting confirmation to the afterglow theory invoked by Frail et al. (2001). In particular, the noticeable differences between the Amati and Ghirlanda slopes confirms the very weak dependence of opening angle on  $E_{iso}$ , which may have otherwise gone without direct observational confirmation.

This research was supported by the Israel-US Binational Science Foundation, an Israel Science Foundation Center of Excellence Award, and the Arnow Chair of Theoretical Physics.

### A. Analytic derivation of the $E_{iso} - \nu_p$ relation

Consider the emission from an annular jet centered around the  $z$ -axis, and having an opening angle  $\theta_0$  and angular width  $\Delta\theta$ . Denote by  $\hat{\beta}$  the directions of emitting fluid elements (assumed to have a fixed Lorentz factor  $\Gamma$ ) and by  $\hat{n}$  the sight line direction, respectively, and define  $\cos \theta_\beta = \hat{\beta} \cdot \hat{z}$ , and  $\cos \theta_n = \hat{n} \cdot \hat{z}$ . Then  $\hat{n} \cdot \hat{\beta} = \cos \theta_\beta \cos \theta_n + \sin \theta_\beta \sin \theta_n \cos \phi$ , where  $\phi$  is the azimuthal angle. Assuming that each fluid element emits isotropically in its rest frame a total energy  $E'$ , then its contribution to the overall energy emitted into a solid angle  $d\Omega_n$  around the sight line direction  $\hat{n}$ , as measured in the Lab frame, is:  $dE(\hat{n}, \hat{\beta}) = (E' \mathcal{D}^3) d\Omega_n$ , where  $\mathcal{D} = 1/\Gamma(1 - \beta \cdot \hat{n})$  is the corresponding Doppler factor. The fluence along the line of sight is given by the integral

$$E_{iso} = \int \frac{dE(\hat{n}, \hat{\beta})}{d\Omega_n} d\Omega_\beta \propto \int \mathcal{D}^3 \sin \theta_\beta d\theta_\beta d\phi. \quad (A1)$$

Define  $\Delta = \theta_n - \theta_\beta$ , and assume small angle approximation, viz.,  $\Delta\theta < \theta_0 \ll 1$  and  $\Delta < \theta_0$ , the Doppler factor can be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{D}(\Delta, \chi) = \frac{1}{\Gamma[1 - \beta \cos \Delta + \beta \sin \theta_\beta \sin \theta_n (1 - \cos \phi)]} \simeq \frac{2}{\Gamma[\Gamma^{-2} + \Delta^2(1 + \chi^2)]}, \quad (A2)$$

where  $\chi^2 = 2 \sin \theta_\beta \sin \theta_n (1 - \cos \phi) / \Delta^2$ . Define  $\eta^2 = 2 \sin \theta_\beta \sin \theta_n / \Delta^2$ , and

$$F(\Delta) = \int_0^\eta \frac{d\chi}{(1 + \chi^2)^3 (1 - \chi^2 / 2\eta^2)}, \quad (A3)$$

equation (A1) can be written, for angular separations  $\Delta^2 \gg \Gamma^{-2}$ , as

$$E_{iso} \propto \int_{\Delta_{min}}^{\Delta_{max}} \frac{8}{\Gamma^3 \Delta^5} \left( \frac{\sin(\theta_n - \Delta)}{\sin \theta_n} \right)^{1/2} F(\Delta) d\Delta, \quad (A4)$$

with  $\Delta_{min} = \theta_n - \theta_0$ ,  $\Delta_{max} = \Delta_{min} + \Delta\theta$ . In the limit considered here, viz.,  $\Delta \ll \theta_0 < \theta_n$ , we have  $\eta \gg 1$ , so that  $F(\Delta) \simeq \int_0^\infty (1 + \chi^2)^{-3} d\chi = 3\pi/16$ , and  $\sin(\theta_n - \Delta)/\sin \theta_n = 1 - O(\Delta/\theta_n)$ . Equation (A4) reduces to  $E_{iso} \propto \Gamma^{-3} \Delta_{min}^{-4}$ . For a jet emitting an intrinsic single universal spectrum with a peak frequency  $\nu^*$ , the observed spectral peak will be located at  $\nu_p = \nu^* \mathcal{D}(\Delta_{min}, \chi = 0) = 2\nu^*/(\Gamma \Delta_{min}^2)$  for sight lines outside the jet (EL04), whereby we obtain  $E_{iso} \propto \Gamma^{-1} (\nu_p/\nu^*)^2$ . Similar result can be readily derived for sight lines inside the hole. Numerical integration of eq. (A1) for a wide range of parameters and viewing angles is presented in EL04.

## REFERENCES

- Amati, L. et al., 2002, A&A, 390, 81
- Atteia, J.-L., Ricker, G.R., Lamb, D.Q., Sakamoto, T., Graziani, C., Donaghy, T., Barraud, C., & the HETE-2 Science Team, 2004, AIP Conf. Proc.: Gamma-Ray Bursts: 30 Years of Discovery, 727, 37
- Band D.L., et al. 1993, ApJ, 413, 281
- Band D.L., Preece, R.D., 2005, ApJ, submitted (astro-ph/0501559)
- Bosnjak, Z., Celotti, A., Longo, F. & Barbiellini, G. 2005, MNRAS submitted (astro-ph/0502185)
- Eichler, D. 1982, ApJ, 263, 571
- Eichler, D. & Jontof-Hutter, D. 2005, ApJ submitted (astro-ph/0503537)
- Eichler, D. & Levinson A., 2000, ApJ, 529, 146
- Eichler, D. & Levinson A., 1999, ApJ, 521, L117
- Eichler, D. & Levinson A., 2004, ApJ, 614, L13 (EL04)
- Frail, D. A. et al., 2001, Ap. J. 562, L55
- Ghirlanda, G., Ghisellini, G & Firmani, C. 2005, MNRAS submitted (astro-ph/0502186)

- Ghirlanda, G, Ghisellini, G & Lazzati, D. 2004, ApJ, 616, 331 (GGL04)
- Guetta, D., Piran, T., Waxman, E. 2005, ApJ, 619, 412
- Jimenez, R., Band, D.L. & Piran, T. 2001, ApJ, 561, 171
- Lamb, D.Q., et al. 2004, NewA Rev., 48, 459
- Levinson, A. & Eichler, D. 2000, PRL, 85, 236
- Levinson, A. & Eichler, D. 2003, ApJ, 594, L19
- Nakamura, T. 1998, Prog. Theor. Phys., 100, 921
- Nakar, E. & Piran, T., 2004, Ap. J. 598, 400
- Nakar, E. & Piran, T., 2005, astro-ph/0502186
- Norris, J.P., Marani, G.F. & Bonnell, J.T. 2000, ApJ, 534, 248
- Norris, J.P. 2002, ApJ, 579, 386
- Toma, K. Yamazaki, R. & Nakamura, T. 2005, astro-ph/0504624
- van Putten, M.H.P.M., & Regimbau, T. 2003, ApJ, 593, L15
- Yamazaki, R. et al., 2004, ApJ 606, L33